

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

<b>JOHN DOE,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	<b>NO. 3:18-cv-00471</b>
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	<b>JUDGE CAMPBELL</b>
<b>STATE OF TENNESSEE, et al.,</b>	)	<b>MAGISTRATE JUDGE NEWBERN</b>
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**ORDER**


Pending before the Court is the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 156). In response, Plaintiff filed an “Appeal from Report and Recommendation” (Doc. No. 157). Defendants filed a response. (Doc. No. 159).

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 72.02, a district court reviews *de novo* any portion of a report and recommendation to which a specific objection is made. *United States v. Curtis*, 237 F.3d 598, 603 (6th Cir. 2001). General or conclusory objections are insufficient. *See Zimmerman v. Cason*, 354 F. Appx. 228, 230 (6th Cir. 2009). Without specific objections, “[t]he functions of the district court are effectively duplicated as both the magistrate and the district court perform identical tasks.” *Howard v. Sec. of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). Thus, “only those specific objections to the magistrate’s report made to the district court will be preserved for appellate review.” *Id.* (quoting *Smith v. Detroit Fed’n of Teachers*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987)). In conducting the review, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's filing. (Doc. No. 157). It is clear from those objections that Plaintiff disagrees with the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. However, Plaintiff fails to provide a basis to reject or modify the R&R because his objections do not identify any specific factual or legal error made by the Magistrate Judge. Instead, Plaintiff essentially re-briefs his entire merits argument. This is insufficient to invoke *de novo* review. Objections that do not identify an error are meritless. *See Howard*, 932 F.2d at 509; *Drew v. Tessmer*, 36 F. App'x 561, 561 (6th Cir. 2002) ("The filing of vague, general, or conclusory objections does not meet the requirements of specific objections and is tantamount to a complete failure to object.").

Having reviewed the Report and Recommendation and considered Plaintiff's filing, the Court concludes that the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 156) should be adopted and approved. For the reasons stated therein, this case is DISMISSED without prejudice for lack of jurisdiction.

It is so **ORDERED**.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE